

REMARKS

In accordance with above amendments, claims 51, 55-57, 59 and 63-64 have been amended. Claims 51-53, 55-57 and 59-64 remain under consideration in this application. No claim has been allowed.

It is believed that the amendments to the claims overcome each of the enumerated rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, raised by the Examiner and others discovered by the applicants. Also, a description of Figure 7 has been added to the specification.

With respect to the rejections of the claims on the merits, it is now believed that all of the present claims do distinguish over the applied references. Note that the present claims require a unitary curved arm structure which represents a simplification and advance over the compound arm structures as shown by Brandt '100 and McNeilus '429, realizing an efficient simple structure. The compound arm systems of Brandt and McNeilus are also fully extended and not curved as extended in the lift and dump sequence.

The Duell et al '497 reference depicts a front loading fork/arm system in which cylinder end points are mechanically cushioned (not speed controlled) to prevent banging at the end points. The reference shows an arm potentiometer AP₁ at column 12, but does not use this for control and that reference does

not include any description that would enable such a control function. Particularly, the reference does not teach the use of a sensor and speed control. Speed control is by mode of operation, i.e., whether auto or manual operation is used. Tordenmalm et al '582 does show a type of piston speed control device in the form of an electronic braking device. That control system is based on the relative position of the piston and the cylinder and not upon any external signal.

The combination cited in Items 8 and 9 include the Sizemore et al '576 reference to show the use of a rotary actuator to pivot a lift arm. Sizemore et al do show a side loading refuse collection vehicle which utilizes rotary actuator 49 to rotate arm 18 through a very limited minor arc to adjust the position of their grabber for accessing containers. Their rotary actuator does not participate in the lift and dump operation which is handled by a chain system. Thus, it is not believed that Sizemore et al '576 teaches or would lead one to go to a full pivot system with reduced radius occasioned by the shape of the support arm.

Thus, it is believed that the system of the present claims is not rendered obvious by any of the cited combinations of references. A comparison of the devices of the references with the lift and dump mechanism of the present invention reveals a simplified mechanical assembly which features but a single

rotary motion to accomplish the lift and dump sequence. No articulation of the arm or arm is necessary, nor is any additional container tipping mechanism.

In view of the above amendments, taken together with the remarks herein, applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of their claims.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.



C. G. Mersereau,
Attorney Reg. No. 26,205
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820 International Centre
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 339-7461